



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Principles, which is to complete the plan of the entire work, will not be long delayed, and that when it comes it will reveal the author at his best in scientific precision in combination with his never failing felicity of presentation.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Edited by JAMES A. H. MURRAY, LL. D. Part III. Batter-Boz. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. 1887.

An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth, D. D., F. R. S. Edited and enlarged by T. NORTHCOTE TOLLER, M. A. Part III. Hwi-Sar. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. 1887.

The great English dictionary is progressing slowly. The preface to Part II (see Journal, VII 514) was dated September, 1885, and that to Part III is dated January, 1887, although Part III was not received in this country until some months later. It continues to be characterized by fullness and thoroughness, and the immense amount of labor necessary to secure these objects causes the publication to be necessarily slow. Part III contains 8765 words, of which 5323 are main words, 1873 combinations, and 1569 subordinate entries. Of the 5323 main words, 3802 are in current use, 1379 obsolete, and only 142 foreign, or imperfectly naturalized.

Every article is replete with interest and information. A glance at the twelve closely printed columns comprising the treatment of the verb *Be* well shows the systematic completeness of the work. We find *Blizzard* duly recorded, but in its usual meaning no earlier example is given than one in a letter of Dec. 29, 1880, from Chicago to the *Manchester Evening News*. *Boycott* appears on the last page, the earliest example being from *The Times* of Nov. 20, 1880, so that these two words have come into current use within eight years. The earliest example of *Boy* is from *Beket*, c. 1300. It occurs in both *Kyng Horn* and *Havelok the Dane*, thought by some to be a quarter of a century earlier; but as Dr. Murray assigns the date c. 1300 to each of these, he doubtless did not think it necessary to record these passages. It looks singular to see the word *Bower*, as used in *Euchre*, occurring in literature not earlier than 1871, and that in Bret Harte's *Heathen Chinnee*, when it has been so long used colloquially. I doubt not that many American works, such as Baldwin's "Flush Times," or Judge Longstreet's "Georgia Scenes," would show much earlier examples. We find *Blaze* and *Blazed*, as applied to animals, first used in the seventeenth century, but *Blaze-faced*, so common in this country, is not recorded. Both words, as applied to trees, are marked "U. S.," and the earliest examples given are from Wesley's works, 1737. *Blatherskite*, spelt also *Bletherskate*, is marked "dial. and U. S. colloq." The latter form is quoted from the Scotch song *Maggie Lauder*, c. 1650, while of the former, the usual form in this country, no earlier example is given than one from Bartlett's *Americanisms*, 1848. While we find many compounds of *Blue*, and even *Blue-nose*, "a nickname for a native of Nova Scotia" (Judge Haliburton's *Clock-maker*, 1837-40), we miss the "*Blue-hen's chickens*," who certainly deserve a

position in the great dictionary, if the *Blue-noses* are honored with one. Among these compounds *Blue Peter* appears, both in its older nautical sense, and in its more recent application to the signal for trumps in Whist, of which the earliest example given is from Beeton's Handy Book of Games, 1875. The term has crossed the ocean to this side, and has risen above the level of slang. Scotland is credited with the verb *Bend* = "to drink hard," and the noun *Bender* = "a hard drinker," but the cognate Americanism "on a bender" finds no place, so it must still be relegated to the dictionary of slang. It is somewhat remarkable that the etymology of *Big* has not yet been discovered. Dr. Murray says that it is "first known in end of thirteenth c. in writers of Northumbria and North Lincolnshire: hence perhaps of Norse origin"—which Prof. Skeat had already suggested—"but its derivation is entirely unknown." The earliest example given is from the Havelok. Another common word of unknown etymology is *Bigot*. This part of the dictionary ends with *Boz*, but its use as a pseudonym by Dickens is unrecorded.

The few illustrations here given show the minuteness with which the vocabulary of the language is being treated. It would be well if a larger number of distinctively American works were read, lest many words, chiefly colloquial, should lack record in the pages of this invaluable Thesaurus of the English language. It should embrace the whole vocabulary of both branches of the English-speaking race, for, when once completed, it will be a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί*, and it is not likely that the work will be done over again within the lifetime of any now living, if ever.

After five years intermission we welcome Part III of the Bosworth-Toller Anglo-Saxon dictionary, of which Parts I and II were noticed in this Journal (V 359). This part is unaccompanied by any preliminary statement, so that we are not informed as to the respective shares of Prof. Toller and the late Dr. Bosworth. It will be noticed, however, that the letters of the alphabet are not treated as fully as heretofore. Under *í* we do not find the repetition of Dr. Bosworth's statement that it was pronounced as in Modern English, e. g. A.-S. *wín* = *wine*, which pronunciation is upheld by Dr. Weymouth, but all remarks on pronunciation are omitted. I hoped to find some further elucidation of *icge gold* (Beowulf, 1107), and *incge lāfe* (Beowulf, 2577), but nothing further has been discovered. In the few words examined I cannot find that any addition has been made to Grein from the poetic vocabulary. Prof. Toller's great service to Anglo-Saxon lexicography is the incorporation of the prose vocabulary with that of the poetry in one work, and the giving us for the first time a fairly complete dictionary of the Old English language. An illustration of the extent to which the vocabulary is thus increased may be found under *regol*. Grein gives but *one* example from the poetry (Guthlac, 460), which is duly entered; but Prof. Toller divides the meanings of *regol* into three subdivisions, under the first of which we have *nine*, under the second *two*, and under the third *ten* examples from the prose. Also, Grein finds but one compound, *regol-faest*, in the poetry. This is given by Toller, although with no citation but that from Grein, and *seven* other compounds are added from the prose. This develops into more than a column of fine print what occupies four lines in Grein. *Per contra*, under *reord*, but *two* examples are given from the prose, one from Kemble's Matthew, Rushworth MS (here *gēcȝðeƿ* should be *gēcȝpæƿ*, Skeat's ed.),

and one from Smith's Baeda. All the rest are taken from Grein, and some of those given by Grein are omitted. *reodian* is given with the example from the Elene 1239, after Grein, but with no meaning, only (?). Grein says "*cribrare?*" and Zupitza "*nach Grein, sieben,*" so the student should have had at least this much help to the meaning. Some words just here have been examined, as *reódan*, *redfan*, *reónig*, *reónig-móð*, *reord-berend*, with the result that the only citations are those from Grein. The form *reóni*, given by Zupitza, is not noted, and *reónig-móð*, Elene 320, is wanting in Grein and here. The inference from this is that Prof. Toller has not made use of the glossaries to separate pieces of A. S. poetry, as that to Zupitza's Elene, for example, and has relied upon Grein for the poetic vocabulary. Grein's citations, while very full, and full enough for all ordinary purposes, are not complete; but, except in the case of very common words, it would be well for a later lexicographer to make use of all available helps to secure completeness in citations of examples. Perhaps omissions of words will be found by those who search for them, but it is probable that they will be few. Prof. Toller seems to have taken great pains to secure accuracy in the prose vocabulary, and is to be congratulated on the result. I hope that Part IV is so far advanced that we shall not have to wait another five years for it. An appendix will doubtless be needed, but that can be prepared more at leisure.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Epicurea. Edidit HERMANNUS USENER. Leipzig, Teubner, 1887.

With winning frankness Professor Usener tells us in the preface to his *Epicurea* that he was attracted to Epicurus, not by his admiration of the Philosophy of the Garden, but by the difficulty and obscurity of our great source of information on the subject, Diogenes Laertius. He cared more for the philological nuts to be cracked than for the philosophical fruits to be gathered. However, the discovery that much help was to be gained from a study of the MSS led from one thing to another. If a part is to be mastered, the whole must be understood, and the result is a most important contribution to the documentary history of Greek philosophy, and not only so, but a study full of interest and instruction even to those *homines grammatici* who usually have little pleasure in Epicurus and things Epicurean.

After an account of the codices and the principal critical editions of Diogenes L., and after supplementing his own work by a number of emendations, Usener takes up the question of the attitude of D. L. towards Epicurus, and denies that he was either Epicurean or Empiric. A man who knew no Epicurean later than the time of Zeno could not have been an Epicurean. A man who did not know Sarapion or Glaukias could not have been a physician of the Empiric sect.

As for the sources of D., Usener agrees with Wilamowitz in thinking that it is high time to put an end to investigations about your 'tenth transmitters' of other people's learning, about Demetrius, Diocles, Favorinus. Why, those who have called Diogenes a miserable compiler or an unqualified ass have done him too much honor. D. did not rise even to the dignity of being a copyist; he merely hired other people to copy for him, and on the strength of this literary activity took to himself the glory of authorship. In those days a man bought books as one buys wines, and decanted them as one decants wines, not